

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 13-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 13, 15, 16, 21, 23, 30 and 31 are amended and claims 11 and 12 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below; (b) does not require any further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for an appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendment to claims 1 and 30 relates to allowable subject matter that was previously recited in dependent claims 2 and 31, respectively. Furthermore, each of claims 13 and 15 have been rewritten in independent form including subject matter previously recited in claims 11 and 12. The other minor amendments are merely for clarity. Thus, no further consideration is necessary by the Examiner. Entry is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 22-29 are allowable and that claims 2-10, 13-20, 31 and 33-36 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,671,227 to Keller in view of U.S. Patent 6,266,327 to Hernandez-Valencia. The Office Action also rejects claims 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,442,163 to Chopping. Finally, the Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chopping in view of

Hernandez-Valencia. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

As stated above, the Office Action indicates that each of dependent claims 13 and 15 contain allowable subject matter. By this Amendment, each of dependent claims 13 and 15 is rewritten in independent form including features previously recited in independent claims 11 and 12. Independent claims 13 and 15 therefore define patentable subject matter. Claim 21 depends from claim 13 and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

With respect to independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 30), the Office Action indicates that Keller does not disclose the claimed second circuit that excludes the input data having an improper start point based on a frame start detecting value and that outputs reframed data having a normal frame format, wherein the reframed data is based on the excluded the input data. The Office Action then relies on Hernandez-Valencia as disclosing excluding input data having an improper start point based on a frame start point detecting value. The Office Action references Hernandez-Valencia's col. 2, lines 57-60 and col. 9, lines 38-42 for these features. The Office Action also asserts that Hernandez-Valencia outputs reframed data having a normal frame format, wherein the reframed data is based on the excluded input data. See col. 9, lines 21-22.

However, Hernandez-Valencia does not teach or suggest the claimed second circuit that excludes the input data having an improper start point based on the frame start point detecting

value. That is, Hernandez-Valencia excludes data based on a PTI value. See col. 8, line 52-col. 9, line 12; col. 9, lines 38-42, and col. 10, lines 49-53. The PTI value is not a frame start point detecting value. In order to determine whether to make a PTI field be a non-conforming code or a conforming code, Hernandez-Valencia disclose several techniques such as that shown in steps 330, 335 and 345 (in Figure 3) and col. 6, lines 39-51, to determine if a cell is conforming or not. These determinations are not related to a frame start point detecting value. As such, Hernandez-Valencia does not teach or suggest a second circuit that excludes the input data having an improper start point based on the frame start point detecting value, and that outputs reframed data having a normal frame format, wherein the reframed data is based on the excluded input data. As such, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1 (or independent claim 30). Independent claims 1 and 30 therefore define patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of claims 1-10 and 13-36 define patentable subject matter. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 and 13-36 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the

Serial No. 09/470,982  
Reply to the Office Action dated January 28, 2004

Docket No. DR-001

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

**Date: April 26, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**